**TIME-LINE AND DOCUMENTS RE EIGHTEEN AND UNDER (18u) AND DUNDEE CITY COUNCIL (DCC)**

We are frequently asked what exactly has transpired between Eighteen and Under (18u) and Dundee City Council (DCC) since 2008. Nearly everyone (locally) knows that Dundee City Council had a fall out with Eighteen And Under. The Council has forbidden many agencies to work with Eighteen And Under and agencies have been threatened with losing their Council funding if they work with the charity. The Council regularly reminds everyone that they won’t work with 18u and make a point of saying they do not approve of 18u. No reason is given and the same thing is reiterated over and over again, DDC does not approve of 18u and has “concerns about recruitment, governance and child protection policies”.

18u has always tried to be transparent so we have decided to record the sequence of events which led to the present situation, together with supporting documents, and to make all this information available online, allowing the facts to speak for themselves.

To set the scene, by the autumn of 2008, 18u had been receiving funding from Dundee City Council for some 14 years. There had been no problems regarding policies - in fact, the Council had helped to draw these up. 18u had won local, national and international awards for it’s work, particularly the Violence Is Preventable programme which was rolling out across the UK. 18u was (and still is) a very small charity with a handful of paid workers and heavily dependent on volunteers.

For further clarity, the events that unfolded were prior to laws which now protect LGBT people from discrimination. Also, it is worth noting that DCC were about to undergo a Child Protection inspection (which they later failed) and 18u was working with young people who were in the care of DCC. It is also worth stating that 18u did openly welcome people from the LGBT community.

In October 2008, one of 18u’s volunteer workers was asked by the mother of a boy he was supporting to shelter the child for the night at his home, owing to a crisis within the family. The mother said that she had previously telephoned Social Services, asking them to take care of her son for that night, but they had refused. She knew, at the time of making her request, that the volunteer involved was gay, but this did not concern her. Although the volunteer knew that it was against 18u’s rules, the volunteer took the boy home with him for one night, without telling 18u.

On 10th December 2008, 18u was informed by a social worker that the volunteer had breach policy and immediately interviewed the volunteer involved and dismissed him on the spot.

Nobody, including Dundee City Council’s Social Work Department, ever accused the volunteer of any more serious breach of conduct, than breaking 18u’s rules. There was no question of child protection issues and, although no longer a support worker, the ex-volunteer continued on good terms with the family in question, and was still welcomed into their home - something which neither 18u nor, indeed, Dundee City Council, had any right to prevent.

Documentary records of the repercussions which followed are listed by date below.

**8th October 2008** - A meeting took place between 18u and DCC to discuss the Violence Is Preventable (VIP) project (see email No 1, from the Outcomes Officer - Fairer Scotland Fund). No problems between 18u and the Council are mentioned in the email and everything appears positive.

**10th December 2008** - 18u are informed by a social worker (who had phoned to refer a child to 18u) that an 18u volunteer has broken 18u rules. On the same day 18u interviewed the volunteer involved, find out that he has indeed broken the rules and instantly dismiss him.

**30th December 2008** - Dundee City Council write to 18u saying that information has been received “outlining concerns regarding matters relating to procedures and practice”. The concerns relate to two matters: recruitment and selection; and professional boundaries between “project staff and clients” (see Letter No 1).

**5th January 2009** - 18u receive the above letter and information requested is dispatched by return of post. In an accompanying letter, 18u asks DCC to clarify the exact nature of their concerns (see Letter No 2).

**14th January 2009** - A letter from DCC requests further information, in anticipation of a meeting with 18u which has been arranged for 23rd January (see Letter No 3). 18u complies with this request on the same day. Note that they are asked about relationships between people.

**23rd January 2009** - A meeting takes place between 18u and officers of DCC. Laurie Matthew (18u founder and manager) and her same sex partner (a volunteer and also police officer of over 20 years standing) attend for 18u. During this meeting a senior social worker states that the volunteer who has been dismissed was a ‘homosexual with a male boyfriend’. The implication was that his breach of the rules had involved child-protection issues. Margo Dymock, Children’s Services Manager, Residential Child Care, Social Work Dept. DCC headed up this meeting and according to 18u, was extremely homophobic. This was later denied by DCC however, DCC demanded to be told the relationships between everyone within 18u. They were provided with this information by 18u.

18u again asks DCC to state the precise nature of their complaint.

**28th January 2009** - 18u begin to think of seeking legal advice (see email No 2). Laurie Matthew has informed 18u of the homophobia and complained to 18u management of bullying tactics by DCC. She refuses to attend further meetings.

**31st January - 1st February 2009** - 18u write a letter to DCC stating that, further to the meeting on 23rd January, they are attempting to clarify matters by carrying out a full internal investigation into the volunteer who was dismissed. They add that the meeting has left them with some “serious issues and concerns” of their own (see Letter No 4). A revised version of the letter specifies those issues, which relate to inappropriate questions asked by DCC at the meeting of 23rd January (seeLetter No 4a), but neither draft is put in the post until 3rd February (see below).

**2nd February 2009** - email correspondence between 18u and their legal advisers, reporting progress on addressing the council’s concerns, and stating that a meeting between DCC and 18u’s Management Committee is being requested; plus an email from 18u’s solicitors suggesting amendments to the letter (see emails Nos 3, 3a, 3b, 3c and Letter 4b).

**3rd February 2009** - The final version of the letter to DCC is despatched (see Letter no 5).

**4th February 2009** - Letter from DCC to 18u confirming confidentiality of matters discussed at the meeting of 23rd January, and stating that the Council are preparing a response (see Letter No 6).

**5th February 2009** - 18u’s solicitors send email advice to 18u regarding the information inappropriately requested by DCC at meeting of 23rd January (see email No 4).

**6th February 2009** - email from 18u’s solicitors and amended version of 18u’s draft report of their internal investigation to the Council following on meeting of 23rd January (see email No 5 and Draft Report).

**9th February 2009** - 18u write to DCC to advise them that their internal investigation is now complete, and they would be happy to answer the questions for which they were unprepared during the meeting-without-Agenda on 23rd February. They request a meeting, with this end in view (see Letter No 7, and the report on the internal investigation). No response to this request is ever received.

**10th February 2009** - email correspondence between 18u and the Outcomes Officer of DCC’s Fairer Scotland Fund, who says that a meeting is being set up to discuss a letter which will soon be sent to 18u by the Council (see emails Nos 6 and 6a).

**11th February 2009** - email correspondence regarding 18u’s unanswered request for a meeting to address the concerns raised by DCC (see email No 7) and the letter about to be sent from DCC to 18u (see emails 7, 7a). Although a time and date for a meeting at which this letter will be discussed has been set, DCC are unable to say when the letter itself will be issued.

**13th February 2009** - 18u receives a letter from DCC stating that they still have a complaint and concerns, that they are not satisfied with 18u’s “standards in terms of the protection and safeguarding of children and young people”, that their social workers will no longer “have any further involvement with your organisation”, and that 18u are not to work with under-sixteens or accept any referrals. The Council’s state that their concerns will be shared with the Police, the NHS and Dundee Voluntary Action. The VIP project in Dundee schools must stop, and Fairer Scotland Funding to 18u will finish on 31 March 2009 unless it can be shown that the issues causing concern have been addressed. It is confirmed that a meeting has been set for 20th February 2009. (see Letter No 8).

**13th February 2009** - email correspondence in relation to the meeting organised by DCC for 20th February, and the advisability of seeking legal representation for 18u at that meeting (see emails 8, 8a).

**Throughout February 2009** 18u repeatedly ask DCC for an Agenda for the meeting on 20th February. The reply is that the letter of 13th February ***is*** the Agenda: however, this letter does not make the exact nature of the complaint and concerns clear.

**15th February 2009** - email correspondence between 18u staff states that a final version of the Report answering DCC’s concerns as presented at meeting of 23rd January is now ready, with all names removed (see email No 9 and final version of report: ‘Answer to SWD Allegations January 2009’ in same pocket).

(Several unnumbered 18u internal emails regarding adjustments of report, meetings with lawyers.)

**16th February 2009 - 18th February** - emails establishing legal representation for the meeting on 20th February (un-numbered).

**19th February 2009** - email correspondence between DCC and 18u re the meeting and its Agenda (see emails 10, 10a and 10b).

**19th February 2009** - email correspondence with lawyers re letter to be sent to DCC prior to meeting (see emails 11, 11a and 11b).

**19th February 2009** - email from 18u to DCC stating that a letter from 18u’s solicitor is on the way to the Council, and reply from DCC stating that they will need to see that letter and take legal advice before the meeting of 20th February (see emails Nos 12, 12a).

**19th February 2009** - Solicitor’s letter to DCC requests a copy of DCC’s complaint and detailing of their exact complaint and concerns, plus a copy of the investigations which DCC claim to have held, etc. They also advise DCC that 18u will have a legal adviser present at the meeting on 20th February (see Letter No 10).

**19th February 2009, 5.00 pm** - DCC cancels meeting pending consultation with their legal department(see email No 13).

19th February 2009 - Letter from NHS Tayside to 18u, stating that any “involvement with your organisation” will cease while d18u are being investigated by DCC (see Letter No 11).

**19th -20th February 2009** - email correspondence with lawyers, un-numbered.

**27th February 2009** - 18u receive information on how to lodge a Formal Complaint against the Council (see email 14 and contents of pocket).

**11th March 2009** - email from 18u’s solicitors to 18u, saying that nothing has been heard by them from DCC (see email No 15).

**16th March 2009** - email correspondence between solicitors and 18u, in relation to continuing lack of response from Council. It is suggested by the solicitors that 18u should draft a letter asking for a response, and for funding to be maintained until the end of April (see emails 16, 16a and 16b).

**17th March 2009** - email from 18u to their solicitors, asking them to fax a letter to DCC, asking for a response, and solicitors’ reply (see email Nos 17 and 18).

**17th March 2009** - Solicitor writes to DCC repeating 18u’s request for details of their complaint and concerns, asking them to point out where exactly the problem lies and for details of their investigation, etc (see Letter No 12). It is now four weeks since the meeting was cancelled.

**23rd March 2009** - It seems clear that DCC have now contacted OSCR to complain. Letter to 18u from OSCR stating that 18u is the subject of a complaint, and asking for further information (see **Letter No 13**).

**23rd March 2009** - email from 18u to their solicitors saying that they are keen to initiate a Formal Complaint against the Council, and a reply from the solicitors suggesting they hang on until DCC have been sent a warning letter (see emails Nos 19 and 19a).

**24th March 2009** - A brief answer from DCC to 18u (***dated*** 24th March) promises a full response “over the next week” (see Letter No 15).

**25th March 2009** - Since no reply has been received from DCC, 18u’s solicitors write to them again, repeating the contents of their former letters, and threatening legal action “to recover losses incurred as a result of the Council’s actions”, if no reply is received within 7 days. They also mention that their client is thinking of lodging a Formal Complaint against the Council, and of making a request for disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (see Letter No 14). This letter is faxed to DCC on 25th March (see email No 20).

**26th March 2009** - 18u emails their solicitors to say that they have received Letter No 15 (see above, **24th March**)and email No 21, stating that Fairer Scotland Funding will now continue until 30 April 2009.

**30th March 2009** - 18u finally receives a reply from DCC (dated 26th March). The Council make a number of accusations against 18u, claiming that 18u have no referral system and no records ; that they fail to carry out disclosures on volunteers; that their policies are ineffective (See Letter no 16). However, when working in schools 18u is bound by DCC’s policies, not their own.

**March 30th - 31st 2009** - email from 18u to their solicitors suggesting amendment to the draft reply to the letter from OSCR (see email 22 and document in same pocket, Letter No 17).

**March 31st 2009** - email from 18u to their solicitors pointing out the irrationality of a) DCC’s ban on the VIP programme in schools (since anyone from 18u working in Dundee schools is bound to adhere to DCC’s own policies and procedures); b) their assumption that any organisation is in a position to ensure that its workers never break the rules; and c) their criticism of the qualifications of 18u’s workers, which are better than they need to be (see email No 23).

**1st April 2009** - emails between 18u and their solicitors regarding the possibility of changing the charity’s status to that of a company limited by guarantee. The solicitor suggests waiting until October (see emails Nos 24 and 24a).

**5th April 2009** - Finalised version of the letter to OSCR, in answer to their queries (see Letter No 18).

**7th April 2009** - 18u responds to the accusations in DCC’s letter of 30th March, answering each point in detail. They request an early response, as their reputation has been badly damaged by the Council’s actions

**10th April 2009** - email correspondence between 18u and ‘Tackle Crime in Kirkton’, dealing with the problem of withdrawal of funding (see email No 25).

**14th April 2009** - Letter from OSCR stating that they are satisfied with the information provided by 18u, which rules out any improper connection between trustees of the charity and its employees. OSCR now consider the matter closed (see Letter No 20).

**29th April** - Letter from DCC to 18u to inform them that their funding from the Fairer Scotland Fund will cease as of 30th April 2009 (see Letter 21).

**Ist May 2009** - 18u’s solicitors receive a letter from DCC’s Legal Services Department stating that 18u’s account of the events which precipitated the current situation is at variance with the Social Work Department’s records. They also complain that 18u’s ex-volunteer, dismissed for breaking their rules, continues to frequent 18u’s premises, and blame 18u for the fact that this man is still visiting the family involved in the Council’s original complaint. DCC ask to see the report regarding 18u’s internal investigation, and also wish to see the Scotvec qualifications of the child protection workers in 18u. In addition, DCC raise other issues to do with policy, and ask how it was framed and put into practice. They say that they had not identified 18u’s policy as being inadequate prior to the incident of October 24th 2008 because 18u had not yet (during the past 14 years of amicable cooperation with the Council) undergone DCC’s Approved Provider’s process. They continue to have concerns regarding 18u’s recruitment and selection procedures. The reason DCC give for suspension of 18u’s work in schools, where the Council’s own policies are enforced, is that such programmes would give pupils an opportunity to self-refer to the organisation (see Letter No 22).

1st May 2009 - Letter from 18u’s solicitors to Craig A Thompson, advocate at Parliament House, outlining the history and the current status of the dispute between 18u and DCC, and requesting his professional opinion (see Letter 23).

**1st May 2009** - email to 18u from their solicitors attaching a copy of a letter from DCC’s Legal Services Department (see email No 26).

**1st May 2009** - email from 18u to their solicitors, attaching a draft Formal Complaint against the Council and asking for comments (see email No 27).

**3rd May - 6th May 2009** - email correspondence between 18u and their solicitors formulating a plan of action (Formal Complaint, FOI Request, what information to disclose to DCC, statement to media and/or other funders, possible legal remedies) once DCC has clarified the position with regard to funding (see emails 28, 28a, 28b).

**14th May 2009** - email to 18u from their solicitors discussing future approach, should funding be cut off (see email No 29).

**15th May 2009** - Letter from 18u’s solicitors to DCC’s Legal Department in response to their letter of 28th April, received on 1st May (see Letter No 24).

**15th May 2009** - Letter from DCC saying that though Fairer Scotland Funding has been cut off, 18u should engage with DCC to discuss standards (see Letter No 25).

**15th May 2009** - email to DCC from 18u, with Formal Complaint attached (see email No 30).

**18th May 2009** - Letter (No 26) sent to DCC by 18u, as mentioned in Letter No 27, below.

**19th May 2009** - Letter from Chief Executive of DDC referring to a letter from 18u dated 18th May 2009. He suggests a meeting to discuss “issues around the Eighteen and Under Project” (see Letter No 27).

**20th May 2009** - email from Associate Dean of Continuing and Advanced Professional Studies, School of Education, Social Work and Community Education, University of Dundee, asking 18u not to attend the Approval Event for the Postgraduate Certificate in Childcare and Protection at the university on the following day (see email No 31).

**20 May 2009** - email to 18u from their solicitors, forwarding a copy of the letter from DCC’s Legal Services Department (Letter No 25). The solicitors wonder if this is an indication that the Council want 18u to ‘tweak’ their policies (see email No 32).

**27th May 2009** - Letter from 18u’s solicitors to DCC Legal Services outlining current plans for updating 18u’s policies, agreeing that those policies should adhere to the document “It’s everyone’s job to make sure I’m alright”, and asking for advice on what more 18u can do to meet the Council’s standards (see Letter No 28).

**27th May 2009** - 18u’s solicitors submit a Freedom of Information Request to DCC, asking to be provided with copies of all information relating to the Council’s decision to withdraw Fairer Scotland funding from 18u (see Letter No 29). The letter was sent by recorded delivery on 28th May.

**2nd June 2009** - **Meeting with Chief Executive of Dundee City Council (this was audio recorded). During this meeting, the Chief Executive agreed to organise for 18u to become an approved provider if the complaint was withdrawn by 18u. Even though 18u said that it did not fit the Approved Provider criteria, it was agreed that it would be sorted out in return for the complaint being dropped. (At the same time, it was agreed that the Fostering Assessment for Laurie would go ahead (a personal complaint was also in about this). This didn’t happen so Laurie went all the way to the Ombusman who found in her favour and DCC wrote an apology.)**

**9th June 2009** - Letter from Equalities, Social Inclusion and Sport Directorate of the Scottish Government stating that they have been informed of DCC’s withdrawal of Fairer Scotland funding from 18u, of the exclusion of schools in Dundee from participation in the VIP project, and of the cessation of referrals to 18u by social workers. They are therefore concerned that 18u may have been breaching the conditions of the government grant funding the Taywise project, and ask a number of questions to clarify the situation. They state that no further funding will be forthcoming until they are convinced that the funding conditions laid down in their letter of 26th March, making their grant available, are being fulfilled (see letter No 30).

**15th June 2009** - email correspondence between 18u and their solicitors in relation to the Freedom of Information Request. It is established that a response to this should be expected “no later than Monday 28th June” (see emails Nos 33, 33a).

**12th June 2009 (received 17th June)** - Letter from DCC Legal Services referring to 18u’s meeting on 2nd June with DCC’s Chief Executive to discuss “the way forward”, and asking whether 18u would therefore consider withdrawing their Freedom of Information Request (see Letter No 31).

**19th June 2009** - Letter from Chief Executive of DCC asking for clarification of the situation between the Council and 18u: were the parties “to move forward in a constructive manner preserving each others point of view”, or did 18u intend to pursue their Formal Complaint and Freedom of Information request (see Letter No 32) ? If so he must reconsider his own position.

**29th June 2009** - email from 18u to their solicitors and the solicitors’ reply, discussing the comparative advisability of continuing with the Formal Complaint and FOI Request or dropping them, in favour of concentrating on an application for “approved funder status, in order to restore funding”. A three-pronged approach is suggested by the solicitors: a) yes, 18u wishe to apply for approved provider status next year; b) they are happy to drop the Formal Complaint for the time being, subject to being treated fairly by the Council in respect of Approved Provider status; and c) the FOI request is irrelevant, and an answer will still be required (see email Nos 34, 34a).

**29th June 2009** - Telephone call from 18u to Chief Executive, clarifying the reasons for the FOI request (see reference in Letter No 33).

**6th July 2009** - Letter from 18u to Chief Executive of Dundee City Council, clarifying the current situation between 18u and the Council: 18u wish to apply for approved provider status; they are withdrawing their complaint against the Council for the time being; and they wish to continue with their FOI request, which is independent of these other two matters (see Letter No 33).

**7th July 2009** - Letter from Chief Executive of DCC confirming that 18u’s FOI request is being processed and that 18u should go ahead and arrange “an initial discussion with the Social Work Department’s Contracts Team”, with a view to being given approved provider status (see Letter No 34).

**5th August 2009** (received by 18u’s solicitors on 13th August 2009) - letter from DCC in answer to 18u’s Freedom of Information request, offering limited information and stating that some matters are exempt from disclosure (see Letter No 35).

**11th August 2009** - emails between 18u and their solicitors establishing information required with a view to achieving approved provider status (see emails Nos 35, 35a).

**25th August 2009** - Cover letter from 18u’s solicitors to 18u, to accompany a reply from DCC to 18u’s FOI request, which is now being forwarded to 18u (see entry for 5th August and letter No 36).

**28th August 2009 approx** - Undated letter from DCC’s Senior Contracts Officer apologising for the delay in processing 18u’s application for approved provider status (see Letter No 37 - the same pocket contains handwritten notes recording continued delays in progressing the application over the next few months).

**23rd November 2009** - Letter from Joe Fitzpatrick MSP updating 18u on progress in regaining funding from the Scottish government(see Letter No 38).

**19th January 2009** - Letter from 18u to Joe Fitzpatrick MSP mentioning renewed difficulties being experienced in respect of funding from the Scottish Government (see Letter No 39).

**22nd January 2009** - Reply from Joe Fitzpatrick MSP saying that he has raised the matter with DCC (see Letter No 40).

**26th January 2009** - Letter from 18u explaining that the funding was not provided by DCC, but that the delay in accrediting 18u with approved provider status is causing funding from the Scottish Government to be withheld. Because of this, serious financial difficulties are being experienced (see Letter No 41).

**27th January 2009** - Reply from Joe Fitzpatrick MSP, clarifying his interaction with DCC, and saying that he has asked them why they have not yet processed 18u’s Approved Provider Application. He promises to forward their reply to 18u (see Letter No 42).

**15th March 2009** - Letter from DCC’s Senior Contracts Manager with final report on 18u’s application for approved provider status, which is now refused (see Letter No 43).

**30th March 2010** - Letter from Dean of School of Education, Social Work and Community Education, University of Dundee, giving their reasons for withdrawing the MSc student currently working with 18u and saying that no more of their students will be referred to 18u for the time being. They state that they hope to work with 18u again in the future, and are happy to meet with them to discuss things further (see Letter No 44).

**1st September 2010** **- Minutes of meeting between DCC and 18u regarding 18u’s Application for Approved Provider Status**. The application is refused because of concerns about 1) organisational structure and infrastructure; 2) recruitment and selection; 3) finance (excessive reserves). 18u are advised to “pursue further contact” with a specified council official in order to take up DCC’s offer of support. 18u agree to this, and are told to make a “fresh application … 6 months from the date the organisation receives the Council’s detailed report”.

**5th - 6th May 2010** - email correspondence between 18u and DCC’s Senior Contracts Manager regarding an incident at a school in Angus (see emails 36 – 36d).

**9th November 2010 - APPROVED PROVIDER ASSESSMENT - FINAL REPORT**, plus cover letter to 18u (see Letter No 45).

**9th November 2010** - Letter from Dundee Voluntary Action to 18u confirming an offer of help ‘in developing your policies’ and mentioning that no answer has been received from DDC’s new Chief Executive in relation to their enquiries regarding 18u’s situation (see Letter No 46).

**7th May 2012** - Letter from DCC to 18u responding to issues raised by 18u in relation to their continuing application for approved provider status, and stating that DCC do not consider that “the appropriate level of assurance that appropriate standards of operation are in place” within 18u (see Letter No 2.1)

**28th June 2012** - An FOI request for all information held by DCC in relation to 18u is submitted to DCC (see Letter No 2.2)

**16th August 2012** - 18u request a review of DCC’s failure to respond to their FOI request (see Letter No 2.4 below).

**28th August 2012** - Letter from 18u to DCC noting that no reply to their letter of 28th June, nor any of the requested information has been received, and asking the Council to review its decision (see Letter No 2.3).

**25th October – 6th November 2012** - email correspondence with the Scottish Information Commissioner relating to the validity of 18u’s FOI request. (see emails Nos 2.1).

**7th November 2012** - Letter from Information Commissioner’s office confirms validity of 18u’s FOI request, and stating that a letter has been sent asking the Council to explain its lack of compliance (see Letter No 2.4).

**22nd November 2012** - Letter from DCC to 18u, apologising for delay in responding to 18u’s FOI request. The information enclosed in response to the FOI request does not include records dating from the earliest days of the breach between DCC and 18u, or the time immediately prior to that breach (see Letter No 2.5).

**November 2012** - Letter from Information Commissioner’s office asking for 18u’s response to DCC’s answer to their FOI request. Are 18u a) satisfied with DCC’s response dated 22nd November 2012 ? b) Do they wish the Commissioner to issue a technical decision regarding the Council’s failure to respond within the allotted timescale ? c) Do they wish to submit a substantive application to the Commissioner in relation to the withholding of information and possibly the failure to respond before the deadline ? A written response is required by 5th December 2012 (see Letter No 2.6).

**29th November 2012** - Letter from 18u to Information Commissioner withdrawing the technical application and submitting a new substantive application that the Commissioner consider both the withholding of all information on 18u held by the Council and the Council’s failure to respond to 18u’s FOI in time (see Letter No 2.7).

**29 November 2012** - Letter from Information Commissioner’s office to 18u confirming that 18u’s technical application against DCC has now been withdrawn, but that they are free to take future action against DDC’s “apparent failure to comply with certain requirements of the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002” (see Letter No 2.8).

**13th December 2012** - email correspondence between Information Commissioner’s Office and 18u acknowledging 18u’s new FOI application and its validity (see email No 2.2).

**22nd January 2013** - Letter from DCC to 18u, stating that they are now willing to release more - but not all - of the Council’s records relating to 18u (see Letter No 2.9).

**26th March 2013** - Letter from DCC to 18u accompanying the release of further documents. DCC seem now to be looking at the FaceBook pages of staff in 18u (see Letter No 2.10).

**13 August 2013** - email from 18u to the Information Commissioner’s office, expressing dissatisfaction with DCC’s response to their FOI request. In particular, they wish to see records relating to 18u dating from the period before May 2009. References in later documents held by 18u indicate the existence of such records. This information is necessary if 18u are to understand the reasons leading to their rift with DCC (see email No 2.3).

**15th August 2013** - email from Information Commissioner’s office to 18u, acknowledging receipt of FOI request (see email No 2.4).

**19th August 2013** - email from Information Commissioner’s office confirming the validity of 18u’s FOI request (see email No 2.5).

**2nd September 2013** - email from Information Commissioner’s office allocating an investigating officer (see email 2.6).

21st October 2015 - email correspondence between 18u and the Investigating Officer regarding the unsatisfactory nature of DCC’s response to 18u’s request (see email).

All the documents above (and a few more not listed here) are available in the offices of 18u.